

## REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, the Applicants submit the below remarks and respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-68 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over an article "VolanoChat Java solution turns ordinary web sites into interactive money makers" published as part of Business Wire (hereinafter Volano), in view of U.S. Patent 5,572,643 (hereinafter Judson) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,794,006 (hereinafter Sanderman). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set out below.

Applicants contend neither references alone nor the combination of the references teaches or suggests all limitations of claim 10, or the other independent claims of the present application. The Applicants' arguments shall be presented with respect to claim 10. However, these comments are applicable to the other independent claims of the present application, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these comments and remarks when reviewing the other independent claims for allowability.

Volano does not teach in response to a command received by a computer, establishing a browser region including a browser frame controlled by a browser client on a display device. In addition, Volano does not disclose the chat region being a real time continuously open bi-directional communications chat region. Volano discloses a chat room technology that supports advertisement banners, different languages, user groups, simple installation, etc. Volano does not include a disclosure of establishing a browser region and establishing a chat region contemporaneously with the browser region. In fact, a live demonstration of VolanoChat found at <http://www.volano.com/chat> and referenced in Volano demonstrates that VolanoChat is a simple chat window without any browser regions. Moreover, Volano does not disclose or suggest the chat region being a real time continuously open bi-directional communication chat region.

The Office Action recognizes that Volano does not teach all the limitations of the independent claims of the present invention. Nevertheless, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Volano with Judson and Sanderman in order to arrive at the claimed invention. However, Judson does not disclose in response to a command received by a computer, establishing a browser region including a browser frame controlled by a browser client on a display device. Judson discloses a method of browsing the Worldwide Web wherein the browser displays one or more different types of information messages to the user while the user-requested information is being downloaded from the remote server to the graphical user interface of the client (see Abstract). The displayed messages may be advertisements, notices, copyright information and the like (see Abstract). There is no disclosure in Judson that the browser region is including a browser frame controlled by a browser client on a display device. Moreover, the Examiner is respectfully reminded that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has cautioned against such rote invocation of “ordinary skill in the art” by specifically indicating that when an obviousness rejection is made, an Examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would invoke the use of such elements in the manner claimed. *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Merely indicating, as in the present Office Action, that the claimed invention would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art is inadequate. *Id.* Instead, what is needed is a showing of motivation, either from the references themselves or the knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art, for the combination being relied upon. *Id.*

Furthermore, Sanderman does not disclose establishing a browser region including a browser frame controlled by a browser client on a display device. Sanderman discloses an on-line editing system, which allows system operators to create, modify, link, unlink and delete content nodes in the on-line network (see Abstract). The system provides an ability to an end-user to locate and access a particular chat room in an


intuitive and organized manner when the chart rooms are not presented as a non-hierarchical service (Column 7, lines 9-16). For easier editing, the Sanderman system utilizes tree data structure to present nodes in the on-line network to the system operators (Figures 1 – 2). The tree structure presenting a hierarchical view of the on-line network is presented in a two-pane window (Column 10, lines 31-46), Nowhere in Sanderman there is a disclosure that the two-pain window is a browser region including a browser frame controlled by a browser client on a display device.

The Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) has been addressed, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. The Applicants furthermore submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 24, 2002

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Saina S. Shamilov  
Reg. No. 48,266

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720 – 8300

## **MARKED UP VERSION OF THE CLAIMS**

Please amend the following claims:

66. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 10 wherein the browser frame displays a Web page.